



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE INDIAN TOUR OF THE PRINCE OF WALES.

BY THEODORE MORISON.

THE future King of England is visiting India this autumn; and the event has a political importance which a similar visit could not possess in a European country. The difference between the political antecedents of India and of the self-governing communities of the West causes the two peoples to set a curiously different value upon the sentiment of loyalty. The remark is true, not only of the loyalty due to a sovereign, but of the willing and spontaneous obedience which is offered to any leader. In the Western Hemisphere loyalty is a temperate sentiment, which seldom overrides the right of private judgment; in India, it is understood to imply unquestioning self-surrender. The reason of the difference is obvious enough. The people of the West have been in the habit of combining together to attain political ends; men have grouped themselves to support or attack certain principles of government; and, in consequence of the existence of political ideals, it has become part of our ethical creed to put measures before men. But the mental activity of India has never been exerted in the direction of politics; and, in the jarring elements which made up the Empire, men looked in vain for a general coordinating principle which would provide a theory of government.

The forces which generally tend to give cohesion to modern nations—religion, race and language—are in India generally antagonistic to the unity of the State. Religion, even in Europe, has as often been a cause of dissension as of union; but in India there is a multitude of religions mutually hostile which are essentially opposed to national unity; neither can race in India afford any common bond of union by the system of caste, for the

population is split up into so many impervious compartments. Not only do the people come of different races, but the system of caste tends to keep each race separate and to prevent fusion. India is, also, without the unifying influence of a common language and a common literature; it actually happens that the most widely diffused language, Hindustani, is written in two different characters, for Mohammedans generally use the Persian and Hindus the Sanskrit alphabet, so that what should be one literature is artificially divided into two.

A population so distracted cannot find principles of cohesion in the political theories which have united the people of the West. In the midst of these incongruous claims upon their allegiance there is only one political idea which all men can unite to uphold; and that is common obedience to an individual leader. And it is because the people of India have instinctively realized that obedience to a common ruler was the only principle of cohesion possible to them that they have exalted personal loyalty to the rank of a cardinal virtue. Owing to the absence of political life, civic virtues are, on the whole, rarer in India than in the West; but this one virtue of faithfulness to the hand that gives the salt commands their whole-hearted devotion; and conversely *namak param*, or faithless to the salt, is a term of intolerable blame. This exaltation of obedience, this honor paid to self-effacement, tended of course to strengthen irresponsible despotism, but even despotism is preferable to anarchy; and it was a sure instinct which selected for popular approval the one Indian sentiment which made for political security. It was the same popular instinct which could find no principle of political cohesion except in obedience to the monarch that led the people to lavish upon him titles of tenderness which we are surprised to find applied to an Oriental despot; in popular language the King is invoked as the "Bulwark of the World"; even so unromantic a potentate as the workaday English official is habitually addressed as "Protector of the Poor."

Unfortunately, the present system of government in India was not designed with a view to fit it to the political temperament of the people. It has, indeed, achieved auspicious success in providing the material advantages of good government; it has given the country peace in place of internecine war; it has built roads, railways, and canals and organized excellent postal, forest and

statistical departments; but it has failed to touch the hearts of the people; it affords them no opportunity of gratifying their one political instinct, for it affords no scope for the exercise of personal loyalty. It is so absolutely impersonal that a forgotten humorist of the Civil Service used to describe it as "government by a despatch-box, occasionally tempered by the loss of the key." The official theory is that the local officers are but cogs and wheels in the administrative machinery, and their activity is controlled by regulations and circulars based upon the statistical information which is tabulated at headquarters; as one officer may be assumed to be as competent as another to execute orders, the Secretariat does not scruple to transfer either of them from one end of the country to the other. Every officer, from the Viceroy down to the District Superintendent of Police, is constantly on the move; and the people, bewildered by the rapid succession of unfamiliar magistrates, are unable to fix their affections upon any individual personification of government.

But, in spite of the uncongenial character of the administration, the people have found a way to gratify their national instinct; they have, as it were, discovered the sovereign for themselves and magnified his importance in the government of India. In a strictly practical interpretation of the constitution, the Emperor of India does not exercise much influence upon the course of public affairs; he very rarely addresses his Indian subjects directly, nor are Government measures taken in his name to the same extent as in England; and yet, in the thoughts of the people, he occupies a position of predominant importance. It is to him that their sincerest loyalty is offered; and probably the only sentiment which is without reservation favorable to the existing order is the affection felt for the Royal Family. Reason may convince the people that the English domination is preferable to any possible alternative, but it cannot make that domination palatable, whereas their hearts prompt them to offer their unselfish allegiance to the person of the King. I believe it is no exaggeration to say that King Edward is, politically, the most powerful personage in India; if the country were reduced to anarchy, he would have a much better chance than any other aspirant of obtaining the supreme control.

The death of Queen Victoria was the occasion of an exhibition of feeling the profoundness of which surprised even the

natives of the country; they declared that women, secluded from the world in the female apartments, were weeping for the loss of the Great Queen. I saw men in public places shed tears as upon the occasion of a great public calamity. It is said that in the villages, to which the news spread with amazing rapidity, men foreboded the coming of great trouble; the Bulwark of the World was dead; who in future, they asked, would shield them from adversity? It is, of course, true that the nobility of the late Queen's character inspired a peculiar tenderness and reverence among her Indian subjects, which occasionally manifested itself in forms that the well-educated West would condemn as superstitious. It was, for instance, rumored among the common people of Bombay that the plague was a punishment sent by Heaven upon that city because an unknown malefactor had disfigured the statue of the Queen, and public opinion appears to have acquiesced in the righteousness of the judgment. But, even in the Queen's lifetime, it was recognized that the warm feelings of loyalty which she evoked were owed to her family and not only to herself. I knew an old Mohammedan official who used to be very indignant at the importance of Gladstone in the settlement of public affairs. "Gladstone! Who is Gladstone?" he used to say; "he is a Government servant like myself; why should I give way to his judgment? Now, if it were the Prince of Wales [the present King] I would give my life for him!"

Such being the state of Indian feeling, it will readily be understood why the visit of the Prince of Wales is an event of great political importance. The loyalty felt for a shadowy personage, of whom the people know only by hearsay, becomes tenfold more real and definite when it is associated with a concrete personality; and the object of the present tour is to bring the Prince into personal contact with the people over whom he is one day to reign. From this tour they will derive an impression of what manner of man the future Emperor of India is, and these impressions will be circulated and become part of the general opinion of the country. It is surprising how many stories are still repeated in Indian society about the visit of King Edward, and they all illustrate that considerate courtesy which the people of India have recognized as his distinctive characteristic and by means of which he was able, according to the stories, to find a way out of the novel embarrassments with which he

was sometimes confronted in India. It is related, for instance, that he was once entertained at a state dinner by an Oriental potentate who was little familiar with the social customs of the West. While he was talking to his royal guest, a servant handed him a dish of potatoes, into which the chief, lapsing unconsciously into the simplicity of Eastern manners, dipped his hand and took out a potato with his fingers. He was covered with confusion upon realizing the indecorum of his behavior; thereupon King Edward signed to the servant to hand the dish to him, and, dipping his hand into it, took out a potato and ate it with his fingers in the sight of the whole table. I do not know whether the story is apocryphal or not, but it certainly reflects the opinion which his Indian subjects have formed of King Edward. And there is no doubt that, from the royal visit this winter, stories will be put into circulation which will summarize the Indian reading of the Prince's character.

The royal party is to go over very much the same ground as is covered by the ordinary cold-weather visitor to India; but the object of this extensive tour is not primarily to see the sights of India, but to become acquainted with as many classes and types of Indian society as possible. The Prince's plan was to land early in November in Bombay, a city in which, more than anywhere else, Indian society has assumed a Western complexion. Even the Indian ladies, everywhere the most vigorous opponents of European innovations, have relaxed something of their conservatism in Bombay, and appear in public places in the inimitable grace of their silken draperies. From the bustling streets of Bombay the Prince will pass into the medieval quiet of Rajputana. As in each little state he draws near the capital that nestles at the foot of the rocky citadel, the Rajah will come forth to meet him on a towering elephant, followed by his feudal retainers armed with spears and matchlocks. Thence the Prince goes to the Panjab as far north as Peshawar, a city of central Asia rather than India, whose bazars are thronged with Afghans, Turcomans and Persians. From this point he turns south to Delhi, where it is officially announced that he will inspect Lord Kitchener's camp, and in no place could the heir of Akbar and Shah Jehan more fittingly receive the homage of the Indian army than in the city of the Great Moghul. The historic capital of Hindustan has been shorn of most of its splendor, and on one

side presents a melancholy picture of desolation. For miles to the southwest the ruins of mosques and fortresses encumber the fields, the corn stands high in the courtyards of palaces, and the peasant used, until the coming of Lord Curzon, to stable his cattle in the tombs of forgotten kings.

From Delhi, the Prince will proceed through Agra, Gwalior and Lucknow to Calcutta, the official capital of British India, where, no doubt, will be presented to him the various dignitaries who make up the Government of India. But Calcutta is not primarily an official city, it is the capital of Bengal and the centre of the intellectual activity of the Bengalis, who, whether for good or for evil, exercise a very considerable influence upon opinion throughout India. The politicians of Calcutta are, perhaps, the least temperate of the critics of the Indian Government; but, for that very reason, it is desirable that the Prince should have an opportunity of meeting a few of the foremost public men of Bengal. The great service which the Prince can render to the state, and which can only be rendered by himself or the King, is to strengthen by personal ascendancy the ties of loyalty to the Crown, and in no province is this service more needed than in Bengal. The Prince cannot, of course, allay political discontent; but he may generate another sentiment which would counteract the secessionist tendency.

Upon this, his first, visit the Prince can only take a hasty survey of the social and political problems of India; but even this might be highly important, if it were looked upon as a preliminary investigation to ascertain whether the great political potentialities of the Royal Family could not be employed to serve a great public end. The question to be considered is whether the Prince of Wales, or, failing the Prince of Wales, some other member of the Royal Family, could not be brought into the Government of India. The following outline of the part which the Prince might play in the administration is merely intended to suggest a basis of discussion. Under the present system, the head of the Indian Government is known indifferently as the Viceroy or as the Governor-General, and he discharges two distinct functions which need not necessarily be united in the same person. He is, in the first place, the representative of the Sovereign and, as such, discharges a number of important social and ceremonial duties; and he is, secondly, a very hard-worked

minister, who exercises an active supervision over all the departments of Government. I submit that these two functions might in future be separated. The Prince of Wales, or some other member of the Royal Family, might be created Viceroy of India to act as the representative of the King-Emperor; and the duties of the Governor-General might then be discharged by a private person, who would be the First Minister of the Crown; in Indian phraseology, the Prince-Viceroy would be the Rajah and the Governor-General would be his Diwan. The functions to be assigned to the Governor-General present no difficulty, for they would be substantially the same as he discharges at present in his ministerial capacity; he would simply be relieved of the duty of representing the Sovereign, and would thus gain leisure and quiet in which to devote himself to the business of the State.

The position of the Prince-Viceroy in the Government must be more precisely defined. Substantially, he would play the same part in India as is played in Europe by a constitutional monarch; he would stand aloof from politics and not interfere personally in the administration, but on all public occasions he would appear as the representative of the Emperor. In British India alone, investitures, reviews and entertainment of foreign notables constitute a considerable tale of work; and, in addition to these, there is the enormously important duty of receiving the feudatory chiefs, who, between them, govern as much as one-third of the Indian continent. These are functions which are at present discharged by the head of the Indian Government, though necessarily in a somewhat perfunctory manner. It would be a public gain that they should be transferred to a Royal Prince, who would bring to them greater leisure and long familiarity with courtly ceremonial. But, in addition to these duties, there is a great work to be accomplished which can only be undertaken by an official head of society. Ever since the English took over the government of the country, Indian society has been deprived of its natural leaders; there has never been, properly speaking, a court at Simla or Calcutta, and the heads of Government in the district capitals have been hard-worked English officials, who have had neither leisure nor aptitude to take the lead in Indian society. But the need of some recognized head of society is every year being more keenly felt as Indians are reconstructing their social life upon European lines. The most vitally

important questions of the day in India are not political but social questions, and it is in the solution of these great problems that the most important duties of the Prince-Viceroy would lie, and in regard to which he would be able to exercise a far greater beneficial influence than any minister who is necessarily associated with controversial politics. The Prince-Viceroy would naturally associate himself with all the movements by which the people aim at promoting the prosperity of the country by their own exertions—such, for instance, as the spread of education, the amelioration of the condition of woman's life, the development of agriculture and the economic resources of the country; and his countenance would in a variety of ways give strength and importance to that large number of social movements which nowadays absorb the energies of the most earnest public men in India. This is a domain in which the sympathetic cooperation of Englishmen is always highly valued. The countenance of the Prince-Viceroy would speed the cause of social reform and be enthusiastically welcomed by Indian philanthropists; it would also win for him devoted adherents among the most eminent public men of India. His cooperation would necessarily be confined to non-controversial movements, but that would not materially curtail the scope of his activities, as the great obstacle to reform in India is not prejudice but apathy. The great object which the Prince-Viceroy could achieve would be the creation of the habit of working with the head of the Government, and of looking to the representative of the Emperor for encouragement and guidance in the attainment of public ends.

There will necessarily always be considerable divergence of opinion between English officials and Indian politicians upon the extent to which the administration can be entrusted to the people of the country, and the estrangement which this unending controversy breeds shows no signs of closing up, and thus a disruptive tendency is created which there is nothing in the present system to counteract. But, as already pointed out, a valuable conservative spirit will be evoked when the head of the Government is intimately associated with an influential body of men who are known to be working for the public good; and thus the association of the Prince with the leaders of Indian opinion, joined to the genius of the Indian people for loyalty, might in time create a sentiment averse to a rupture from the British Crown.

A Viceroy who would exercise such an influence upon Indian opinion would have to stay longer in the country than the five years which are at present allotted to him by constitutional custom; a term of ten years would not be too long for such a task. That is a considerable portion of his life for any man to spend away from home, but the high sense of public duty which is traditional in the descendants of Queen Victoria is a ground for believing that the Prince would not refuse to make this sacrifice. It may also not unreasonably be urged that, since the Himalayas and the uplands of the Neilgherries have become accessible from the plains, India is no longer an unpleasant or unhealthy country to live in, and the Prince-Viceroy would not be debarred from visiting Europe during his tenure of office, and for his exile there would be compensations in the supremely important and interesting character of his work. It might, no doubt, be urged that of all the Royal Princes England would least willingly spare the Prince of Wales; but no member of the Royal Family could attempt the task which lies before him in India so successfully as the Heir Apparent; for, even when he had returned to England and mounted the throne, his Hindu and Mohammedan subjects would remember that the Emperor of India was the man whom they had served and with whom they had worked in earlier days, and their loyalty to the Crown would be real, vivid and personal.

I feel sure that the true basis of Imperial rule in India is to be sought in the loyal affection of the people for the Royal Family and that political stability cannot be secured by the extension of popular government. The reason for this is that loyalty to an individual is in the first place congenial to the temper of the people, and that in the second it spares them the humiliation which must otherwise necessarily attach to the domination of one race over another. It is already evident that the concession of merely political privileges will not allay the rising tide of disaffection; the shortcomings of the Government are not the real causes of this discontent, but the ignominy of being a conquered people. This is a grievance which cannot be removed as long as they are constrained by force to remain within the circle of the British Empire, unless they can acquire the habit of feeling that their allegiance is not offered to the British people, but to the Emperor who sits upon the throne of Asoka and Shah Jehan.

THEODORE MORISON.